

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed September 19, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16-19 and 21-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wookey et al. (USP 6,182,249). The Examiner next rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wookey et al. in view of Hansen (USP 6,317,639).

Claim 1 calls for, in part, “separately displaying and identifying” device diagnostic data and device reminder data for a remote device on a GUI. The Examiner indicated that Wookey et al. teaches these elements at column 16, lines 41-58 thereof. However, the cited portion of Wookey et al. relates to an alert display 245 which displays a list of alerts which have arisen. Wookey et al. states that these alerts may take a variety of forms, but are determined or detected from actual condition or state data of the host computer being monitored. *See Wookey et al.*, Col. 12, lns. 1-5, 41-42; Col. 16, lns. 3-15. For example, the system of Wookey et al. monitors disk space on the host computer and can generate an alert when filled disk space approaches or reaches a threshold of 99%. Col. 12, lns. 36-41. Thus, the alerts of Wookey et al. are based on actual condition data and are generated in response to actual conditions or actual trends in a host computer.

In contrast, “reminder data” as called for in claim 1 is based upon some predetermined information. Whereas an alert is determined dynamically from actual conditions, a reminder is preset or pre-scheduled. *Compare Wookey et al.*, Col. 12, lns. 1-5 (describing an alert) *with Specification*, ¶ 43 (describing reminders). A reminder “reminds” of some predetermined information such as regularly scheduled maintenance, but an alert notifies of a previously unknown condition. As discussed above, Wookey et al. regards only alerts, and does not teach or suggest reminders. Therefore, Wookey et al. does not anticipate claim 1, and Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom.

Similarly, claim 9 calls for “a reminder section having a number of reminder indicators configured to display scheduled items relating to the device” that is distinct from “an alert section having a number of alert indicators configured to indicate urgent items relating to a device.” Since Wookey et al. does not teach or suggest reminders or reminder indicators which regard “scheduled items relating to the device,” Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 9 and all claims depending therefrom be withdrawn.

Claim 17 also recites reminder data “wherein the reminder data includes a plurality of scheduled tasks.” As set forth above, Wookey et al. does not teach or suggest reminders of

scheduled tasks. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 and all claims depending therefrom.

In rejecting claim 25, the Examiner grouped the claim into the same rejection as claims 1, 11, and 17. However, claim 25 recites elements not found in these claims. In part, claim 25 calls for the acquisition of automatically-generated data and manually entered data and the consolidation thereof at a centralized processing station. The Examiner has not shown where or how these elements are taught by the art of record. While the diagnostic data in Wookey et al. may be periodically transmitted to the monitoring computer 100 from the host computer 102, Wookey et al. does not appear to disclose that any “manually entered data [acquired] from both the remote facility and remotely from the remote facility” is consolidated with automatically-generated data and jointly displayed on a GUI. *See Wookey et al.*, Col. 4, lns. 4-9; Col. 10 ln. 53 to col. 11, ln. 7 (describing graphical display of host computer and diagnostic data derivations). Since it appears that Wookey et al. does not disclose the elements of claim 25, and since the Examiner has not set forth any basis for asserting otherwise, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 and all claims depending therefrom.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-34.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen J. Gardner/

Stephen J. Gardner
Registration No. 59,057
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 17
sjg@zpspatents.com

Dated: December 19, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.070

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100